

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Office Action mailed May 23, 2006.

In the Office Action, the Examiner (1) objected to claim 59; (2) rejected claims 33, 35, 36, and 60-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,728,074) in view of *Allen et al.*¹ (U.S. Patent No. 5,837,546), *Buse et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,125), and *Shartle et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0059872); (3) rejected claims 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano* in view of *Buse, Davies et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,733,655), and *Shartle*; (4) rejected claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano* in view of *Buse, Davies, and Shartle*, and further in view of *White et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,438,271); (5) objected to claims 34 and 59 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form; and (6) allowed claims 25-32.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 33 and 34. Before entry of this Amendment, claims 25-38 and 58-62 were pending in this application. After entry of this Amendment, claims 25-38 and 58-62 remain pending in this application. Of these claims, claims 25 and 33 are independent.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the amendments to claims 33 and 34. No new matter has been introduced.

¹ Applicants suspect that the Examiner intended to reject claims 33, 35, 36, and 60-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano et al.*, in view of ***Davies et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,733,655)**, *Buse et al.*, and *Shartle et al.* Should the Examiner persist in issuing any rejections under a combination of these references, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the outstanding rejection of these claims. Applicants have nonetheless attempted to be fully responsive to the Examiner's concerns in this paper in an attempt to advance prosecution.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of claims 25-32.

In addition, Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 34 and 59. Consequently, Applicants have amended claim 33 to include a feature of allowable claim 34. Accordingly, independent claim 33 is in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 34-38 and 58-62 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from independent claim 33.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

I. CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 59 stands objected to because of an informality. Specifically, the Examiner asserts "on line 1 of claim 59, claim 39 should be replaced with claim 58." (*Office Action*, p. 2, ll. 6-7). Applicants note, however, claim 59 was previously amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion in the Amendment filed March 15, 2006. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to claim 59 be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 33, 35, 36, and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano*, in view of *Davies*, *Buse*, and *Shartle*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claim 33 to include a feature of allowable claim 34. It is that feature which the Examiner admits is not disclosed in either *Castellano*, *Davies*, *Buse*, *Shartle*, or any other prior art of record. (*Office Action*, p. 7, ll. 2-4). Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 35, 36, 59, and 60-62 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from independent claim 33.

Claims 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano* in view of *Buse*, *Davies*, and *Shartle*; and claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Castellano* in view of *Buse*, *Davies*, and *Shartle*, and further in view of *White*. Claims 37, 38, and 58 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from allowable independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 37, 38, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 25 and 33 are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 26-32, 34-38, and 58-62 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from claims 25 and 33, respectively.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 23, 2006

By: 

Eric P. Raciti
Reg. No. 41,475

for

Louis M. Troilo
Reg. No. 45,284